

Sinclair Broadcasting is, of course, acting within its rights in airing what has been described as a partisan info-mercial on the eve of a presidential election.

The question is: is this good public policy. When the FCC was first created, it had a mandate from Congress to see to it that radio and (later) television operated not to maximize shareholder value but to serve "the public interest." That mandate has never been repealed and stands as the law of the land.

Sinclair's action is the poison fruit of two policy changes: the reduction on limits to concentration of media ownership and the effective elimination of the Fairness Doctrine.

How does this serve the public interest? I submit that it does not -- it serves the narrow financial interest of Sinclair's owners, as well as their partisan political agenda. This case is precisely the kind of domination of broadcasting by plutocrats that the FCC was created to prevent.

Please explain how Sinclair's action strengthens our democracy.

A concerned citizen.

Chris Daly

Boston